

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 10-14, 17-23, 26, 27, 84 and 85. Applicants have now address the Examiner's remaining rejections in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 68-71, 76-83 and 86-88 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner notes that independent Claims 68, 76 and 80 recite "a storage capacitor comprising a portion of said semiconductor layer, a portion of said gate insulating film, a same material as said first conductive layer, and a same material as said second conductive layer." The Examiner contends that it is not clear and indefinite if the word "same" is referring to the gate insulating film or the semiconductor layer.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 68, 76 and 80 to recite "a storage capacitor comprising a portion of said semiconductor layer, a portion of said gate insulating film, a third conductive layer comprising the same material as said first conductive layer, and a fourth conductive layer comprising the same material as said second conductive layer." These features are supported by, for example, Fig. 5 and pages 19-20 in the specification of the present application. For example, the present application discloses a storage capacitor 205 comprises a portion of a semiconductor layer 107, a portion of a gate insulating film 120, a third conductive layer 132 comprising the same material as a first conductive layer 131, and a fourth conductive layer 149 comprising the same material as the second conductive layer 148.

It is respectfully submitted that this overcomes the Examiner's objection to independent Claims 68, 76 and 80, and it is requested that the §112 rejection of Claims 68, 76 and 80 and those claims dependent thereon be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 68-71 and 76-88 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US 6,573,564). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For example, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Yamazaki '564 discloses a gate wiring 1510 in contact with a gate electrode 103. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yamazaki '564 discloses that the "gate wiring 1510 is integrally formed with gate electrodes 1511 and 1512 of TFT." See col. 24, lines 23-24 and Fig. 15. This merely means that the gate wiring 1510 is formed by the same conductive layer as the gate electrodes at the same time. There is no disclosure or suggestion of the claimed features of the gate wiring being in contact with or being overlapped with the gate electrode, the gate wiring comprising a second conductive layer, and the gate electrode comprising a first conductive layer, as in independent Claims 68, 76 and 80.

In addition, even if a transistor is in itself thought of as a capacitance, Yamazaki '564 does not disclose or suggest "a storage capacitor comprising a portion of said semiconductor layer, a portion of said gate insulating film, a third conductive layer comprising the same material as said first conductive layer, and a fourth conductive layer comprising the same material as said second conductive layer," as in independent Claims 68, 76 and 80.

Therefore, independent Claims 68, 76 and 80 are not disclosed or suggested by Yamazaki '564, and Claims 68, 76 and 80 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new dependent Claims 89-93. As these are dependent claims, they are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment or the new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 26, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street; Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500
Customer No. 26568